

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on May 3, 2005.

Claims 31-33 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 8, 15, 17, 24, and 26 have been amended. No claims have been added. As a result, claims 1, 3-15, 17-24, and 26-30 are now pending in this application.

For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicant's remarks concerning the claims will be presented in the same order in which the Examiner presented them in the Office Action.

Amendments to the Title

The title has been amended to more accurately reflect the claimed subject matter by substituting “Methods and Apparatus to Test” for “Method of Testing”.

Amendments to Claims 1, 3, 8, 15, 17, 24, and 26

Each of original claims 1, 3, 8, 15, 17, 24, and 26 has been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 31.

The dependency of claims 3 and 8 has been switched from claim 2 to claim 1.

Independent claim 15 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 32. In addition, “computer system” has been replaced by “computing device”, for which adequate antecedent basis exists.

The dependency of claim 17 has been switched from claim 16 to claim 15.

Independent claim 24 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 33.

The dependency of claim 16 has been switched from claim 25 to claim 24.

Rejection of Claims 24-30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 24-30 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, because the Examiner asserted they were directed to non-statutory subject matter, stating that the medium is not “computer-readable” and the instructions are not executing on a “computer” or “processor”.

Claim 33 has been canceled.

Claim 24 has been amended to read “computational machine-accessible medium” and “computational machine”.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 24 is properly directed to statutory subject matter and requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 24-30 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Rejection of Claims 2-8, 17, 26, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2-8, 17, 26, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the inventive subject matter.

Claim 2 was canceled in Applicant’s “Amendment and Response” of February 8, 2005.

The dependencies of claims 3-8, 17, and 26 have been changed by the above-described amendments made to claims 3, 17, and 26.

Claim 33 has been canceled. The subject matter of claim 33 that was incorporated into claim 24 replaces “computer system” with “machine”, for which there is sufficient adequate antecedent basis.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-15, 17-24, and 26-30
under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)
as Anticipated by Wolff

Claims 1, 3-15, 17-24, and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wolff (U.S. 5,987,625).

In view of the above-described amendments to independent claims 1, 15, and 24, Applicant asserts that they and their dependent claims are all patentable over Wolff, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3-15, 17-24, and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Wolff be withdrawn.

**Examiner's Indication of Allowable Subject Matter and
Corresponding Amendments to Claims 1, 15, and 24**

Claims 31 and 32 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but they were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter previously recited in claim 31, and claim 31 has been canceled. Thus, claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom, should be allowable.

Independent claim 15 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter previously recited in claim 32, and claim 32 has been canceled. Thus, claim 15, and the claims dependent therefrom, should be allowable.

Similarly, independent claim 24 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter previously recited in claim 33, and claim 33 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 24, and the claims dependent therefrom, should also be allowable, because the language of claim 33 is substantively similar to that of claims 31 and 32.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-15, 17-24, and 26-30 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Walter W. Nielsen (located in Phoenix, Arizona) at (602) 298-8920, or the below-signed attorney (located in Minneapolis, Minnesota) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Serial Number: 10/073,546

Filing Date: February 11, 2002

Title: METHODS AND APPARATUS TO TEST COMPUTER SYSTEM COMPONENTS (as amended)

Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 12

Dkt: 884.616US1 (INTEL)

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

JENNY M. PELNER

By her Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 349-9592

Date Aug. 31, 2005

By Ann M. McCrackin
Ann M. McCrackin
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 31 day of August ²⁰⁰⁵

Name

John D. Sustar-Watson

Signature

John D. Sustar-Watson